



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/704,422	11/01/2000	Ronald N. Zuckermann	CHIRP012/1613.002	4637

27476 7590 01/14/2003

Chiron Corporation
Intellectual Property - R440
P.O. Box 8097
Emeryville, CA 94662-8097

EXAMINER

PADMANABHAN, KARTIC

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1641

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/704,422

Applicant(s)

ZUCKERMANN ET AL.

Examiner

Kartic Padmanabhan

Art Unit

1641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-73 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 29-55 and 65-73 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 and 56-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-73 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6,7,8,9.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in Paper No. 11 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that examination of all six groups would not be a serious burden. This is not found persuasive because the record set forth in the previous restriction requirement clearly indicates that the delineated inventions are, in fact, patentably distinct, each from the other, and their different classification would necessitate additional searching. As discussed in the interview, if applicant had wanted a search of multiple groups concurrently, applicant should have placed the claims of other groups in dependent form, rather than maintaining six distinct groups.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A (1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

3. The information disclosure statement filed June 25, 2001 has been placed in the application file, but the examiner has not initialed the references contained therein. All the references listed thereon were previously listed in an earlier filed IDS and were considered.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 26-28 and 56-64 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s) or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form. These claims all recite specific steps involved in the synthesis of the hydrophilic peptoid. However, the claimed invention is drawn to a method for determining an expression pattern. Therefore, as long as the reference teaches a peptoid, the method of making the peptoid is irrelevant to the patentability of the method of determining an expression pattern (absent evidence that the specific method of making the peptoid confers unique characteristics to the peptoid relevant to the determination of an expression pattern).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-28 and 56-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the at least one component" in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

8. Claim 25 is rejected as vague and indefinite because the claim does not end in a period. Therefore, it is unclear if text has been omitted at the end of the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 1-7, 26-28, and 56-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zuckermann et al. (WO 98/42730). The reference discloses methods of preparing substrates, wherein the substrates may be used in screening and/or separation procedures. According to the reference, the substrate surface contains a plurality of hydrophilic sites that can be protected or deprotected. The hydrophilic groups of the reference may be selected from hydroxyls, carboxyls, thiols, amines, and mixtures thereof. The substrates of the reference may also have an organic compound bound to the hydrophilic moieties, wherein the organic compound is a ligand. The ligand may be oligomeric, such as an oligonucleotide, oligopeptide, or oligopeptoid. The separation/screening process includes the step of contacting a sample with the support-bound ligand, which can bind to a component therein. In addition, a plurality of chemically distinct ligands may be provided on the support, such that a ligand of interest may be identified by screening for said ligand. The screening/separation procedure may be a chromatographic separation. Sample, according to the reference is any material in fluid form that has a component of interest. The analyte to be assayed or screened for may be enzymes, oligonucleotides, and others. Claims 26-28 and 56-64 are also deemed to be anticipated by the reference, as the claims are not interpreted as further limiting the parent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

13. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

14. Claims 8-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zuckermann et al. (WO 98/42730). The reference teaches methods for using substrates in analysis, as discussed above. However, the reference does not teach the specific affinity groups required, the percent of affinity groups, or the nature of the sample.

Art Unit: 1641

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use specific affinity groups, a certain percent of affinity groups in the backbone, and any number of different samples with the method of Zuckermann et al. It would have been obvious to use the specific affinity groups required of the pending claims because the reference generally discloses alkyls. It has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416. Further, it would have been obvious to use a specific percentage of affinity groups because it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. Finally, it would have also been obvious to use the specific samples required by the claims because the reference teaches any sample, preferably fluid, containing the analyte of interest is suitable. Therefore, selection of a specific sample simply represents an optimization of the assay protocol and does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art.

Conclusion

Claims 1-28 and 56-64 are rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kartic Padmanabhan whose telephone number is 703-305-0509. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 703-305-3399. The fax phone numbers for the

Application/Control Number: 09/704,422

Page 7


Art Unit: 1641

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-5207 for regular communications and 703-305-3014 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

Kartic Padmanabhan
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1641

January 13, 2003


LONG V. LE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

1/13/01